



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

W/A
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/669,394	09/24/2003	Karlheinz Bartzke	GK-ZEI-3217 / 500343.2022	3961
7590 Gerald H. Kiel, Esq. REED SMITH LLP 599 Lexington Avenue New York, NY 10022-7650			EXAMINER	
			DINH, JACK	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2873	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	03/14/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/669,394	BARTZKE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Jack Dinh	2873		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2007.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-8, 11, 15 and 16 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-7 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-3, 8, 15 and 16 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 11 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 24 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 8, the phrase “first and second levers a rhombic arrangement of at least four second levers” renders the claim indefinite. It is unclear how many first levers there are in this configuration. In addition, neither the specification nor the drawings disclose such configuration having first and second levers a rhombic arrangement of at least four second levers. Therefore, it is unclear of the configuration being claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-3 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable by Hanada (US Patent 5,400,170).

Regarding claim 1, Hanada (figures 2 and 3) is interpreted as disclosing an adjustable pinhole for the illumination beam path of a laser scanning microscope, comprising that the pinhole **2** is defined by foil edges which are adjustable relative to one another, the foils have solid-state joints (see reference 7 of figure 2), which are driven by motor **5** are provided for adjusting the foil edges, a referencing of the stepping motor drive is carried out by means of a path measuring system and/or an optical detector for detecting the amount of light passing through the pinhole (col. 2, lines 48-67; col. 3, lines 15-20, 35-40), wherein the pinhole can be closed in such a way that the foils overlap and at least one of the foils has an offset to prevent collision (see figure).

Regarding claim 2, Hanada (figure 3) is interpreted as further disclosing that wherein at least two foils **1**, each with at least one straight edge **2**, are arranged relative to one another and/or connected to one another in such a way that their edges describe an L-shape and the L-shaped connection pieces are arranged on one another in such a way that they define a rhombic or square light passage and are moved relative to one another for adjusting the pinhole (col. 4, lines 1-30).

Regarding claim 3, Hanada (figure 3) is interpreted as further disclosing that the movement direction is the direction of the bisecting line of the angle defined by the L-shape or of another angle lying within the defined angle.

Regarding claim 15, the process for manufacturing an adjustable pinhole comprising the step of producing foil edges defining the pinhole by cutting the foil material in a straight line individually or in composite on at least one side would be inherent from Hanada's figure 2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanada (US Patent 5,400,170), as applied to claim 15, in view of Bell et al. (US Patent 5,105,582).

Regarding claim 16, Hanada is interpreted as disclosing all the claimed limitations as described above except that the foil edges are treated, preferably by grinding, subsequent to cutting. Within the same field of endeavor, Bell is interpreted as disclosing the teaching that sharpening can be accomplished by grinding a cutting surface to form sharp edges (col. 3, lines 1-3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to grind the cut edges for the purpose of sharpening the edges and improving accuracy.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 12/12/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1 and 15, the Applicant argues that Hanada discloses a scissor-like closure mechanism for a pinhole and does not teach or suggest foil edges as disclosed in the claimed invention. However, the broad claim language does not distinguish between the foil edges and the closure mechanism of the prior art. Therefore, the prior art still read on the language of claim 1.

Regarding claim 16, the Applicant argues one skilled in the art would not combine the teachings of using the method in cutting a golf cup to that of a laser scanning microscope. However, the rejection does not rely on the golf manufacturing technology. The rejection simply rely on Bell's teaching to show an obvious concept that sharpening can be accomplished by grinding a cutting surface to form sharp edges.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claim 11 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter. Regarding claim 11, the prior art fails to disclose a stepping motor which drives

by two spindles running in the same direction, a plurality of plates which are displaceable at different pitches, the foils being fastened to the plurality of plates.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jack Dinh whose telephone number is 571-272-2327. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30 AM - 6:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky L. Mack, can be reached at 571-272-2333. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jack Dinh
03/08/07



Loha Ben
Primary Examiner